DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 038 716 CG 005 321

AUTHOR Crookston, Burns B.
TITLE Coping with Campus Disruption.
INSTITUTION Colorado State Univ., Ft. Collins.
PUB DATE 7 Jun 69
NOTE 15p.; Paper presented at Western Area Conference, Financial Executives Institute, June 7, 1969

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.85
DESCRIPTORS *Activism, *Colleges, *Student Behavior, *Student College Relationship, *Student Problems

ABSTRACT

Following a short introduction about the current status of student unrest and campus disruption, this paper discusses the contributing factors: (1) the unique aspects of the present generation gap; (2) confusion on the role of the university in contemporary society; (3) the inability, on the basis of their organizational structure, of universities to change systematically and rapidly; (4) the prominence of reactive, remediational styles in dealing with students, as opposed to styles which emphasize prevention and student development; (5) the inability of the university to act decisively and effectively; and (6) the inability of the university to discipline promptly and effectively. Suggestions about what can be done are offered: (1) develop a preventive program of crisis intervention and conflict management; (2) deal decisively with disruption; (3) when necessary, act quickly and decisively; and (4) develop orderly disciplinary procedures and processes. The paper concludes by urging the university to deal with educational reform, and implies that this would ultimately be the most effective measure in dealing with the problem. (TL)

ED038716

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

COPING WITH CAMPUS DISRUPTION*

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Burns B. Crookston

In 1964, shortly after the student uprising at Berkeley there were predictions that American higher education would never be the same again.[1] These predictions appear to have been most accurate. Since 1964 there has been a rapid acceleration of disorders and disruption and an escalation of lawlessness. Accompanying these disorders has been fear and confusion among administrators; bewilderment and divided loyalties among faculty, including humiliation and anger directed toward administrators who can't or won't handle arrogant and disrespectful militants; sympathetic involvement in disruptive demonstrations by some junior and a few senior faculty; sustained apathy among the majority of students whose education has been interrupted by radical activists; and a mounting mixture of rage and disgust among the general public whose video implanted image of the college student has contributed to political repercussions that have already severely damaged higher education and threaten to become even more repressive.

Although those institutions where there has been violence and serious disruptions are relatively few, it is fair to say that during the past five years nearly all major colleges and universities in this country have experienced some form of legal or illegal sit-in or other mass violation of rules, many of them silly or anachronistic, but nevertheless contributing toward serious stress. And it is unrealistic to suppose that only at institutions where there is an obvious disruption does a disruption occur. Whenever there is manifest student unrest there is a massive, often unproductive draining off of student, faculty and administration energy that may occupy weeks and often months at a time.

A surge of public backlash is evident in recent Gallop surveys that show increasingly large majorities in favor of expelling campus lawbreakers and for a stronger hand on the part of college administrators. Many also are offended by the appearance and dress of students, the various demonstrations, student drug habits and their alleged permissive attitude toward sex.

In recent months the college crisis has occupied more newspaper space than the war in Viet Nam. Congressional investigation committees have gotten in the act. President Nixon has used several occasions to make it clear that it is "time for faculties, boards of trustees, and school administrators to have the backbone to stand up against this kind of situation."

Unfortunately overlooked in the furor is the solid record of the students in working to improve society by helping the poor and underprivileged, as well as their interest in teaching and other helping professions as a career. Also overlooked are the widespread, yet unheralded and unpublicized efforts by many colleges which have dealt effectively with student unrest.

---

* Based on an address given at the Western Area Conference, Financial Executives Institute, June 7, 1969.

---

1 Sidney Hook, the Trojan Horse in Higher Education. Educational Record, Winter, 1969.

CG005321

This paper is addressed to identifying some factors that are impeding universities from dealing effectively with confrontations, and to some suggestions on how to cope with the problem. Because of particularly Black and Mexican-Americans, this paper is limited to a discussion of the general problems of student unrest.

CONTRIBUTING FACTORS TO THE CURRENT DILEMMA IN HIGHER EDUCATION

I. The Current Generation Gap Is Different

Ever since the history of man was recorded there has been a so-called generation gap. The young have always revolted against the old. What is so different about this generation? The evidence is incontrovertible that there are some very important differences that set this generation apart from previous ones. Since the acceleration of technological change during the past 50 years has made for some difference among intervening generations, to achieve greater validity for this point let us compare the current generation of youth, not with their father or grandfather's generation, but with that of their great grandfather, who grew up at the turn of the century.

To be sure great grandfather rebelled against his elders. But the rebellion was predictable and his growing out of it was equally predictable. After all he was likely to hold the same values as his father - on getting ahead, on economic and financial security, on marriage, the family, the value of the home, on close friendships, on social class structure and social mobility. And he had the same kind of prejudice as his elders, based on religion and race and social class.

Today's college youth shares few of these same values. Affluence and economic security are "givens". Born after the nuclear bomb was exploded in Hiroshima, his entire life has been spent under this nuclear shadow - the awesome awareness that man has the ability literally to destroy himself. He sees war as irrational, terrible, and immoral. Great grandfather viewed war as the roll of drums and distant cannon, as gallantry, patriotism, manhood and honor.

While great grandfather could anticipate living out his life in a reasonably predictable way in a relatively unchanging world, our youth feels time is running out on him. He feels powerless and impotent to cope with the overpowering problems of war, racial injustice, over population and poverty. Great grandfather had plenty of time to think about the world and his place in it through the imagery of books and his own imagination. Events were historical. The rest of the world was distant and far away. Today the instant impact of mass media - of television, the computer, and other electronic gadgetry - allow little opportunity to live within one's self and to think upon one's place in the order of things. The tremendous acceleration in the rate of change and the hugeness of society in its oganizations make the student feel pessimistic about ever having the power to influence corporations, governments, or even the university. He must with great speed adapt intellectually and psychologically to the rapid changes in technology and social structure. These pressures to adapt quickly, combined with the uncertainities of the draft (and the accompanying guilt for college males that they are in college rather than in Viet Nam) make it impossible to predict what life will be like ten years from now. Great grandfather had no such difficulty. Then the debate was whether the automobile would replace the horse.

To the student then, if the future cannot be known, obviously one must live existentially in the present. So he retreats into small human groups. He finds meaning in simple, highly personal contacts with peers because, as Professor Lewis Mayhew put it, "he can comprehend the significance of a touch, a talk, or a smile, where (he) cannot comprehend the mutations of the stock market or of foreign policy."[2]

By the time great grandfather was ready for college he had discovered the world of work, the value of money and how to manage his own personal life and private affairs. He was part of a privileged elite who could go to college, while the great majority of his peers were already taking on the responsibilities of adulthood in the work force and marriage. Today's college student grows up in a time when adolescence has been extended to an entire decade. We have no formalized rite of initiation into adulthood. Professor Bruno Bettelheim recently reported to a House Subcommittee a prolonged period of adolescence "means that one has reached and even passed the age of puberty, is at the very height of one's physical development - healthier, stronger, even handsomer than one has been, or will be, for the rest of one's life - but must nevertheless postpone full adulthood until long beyond what any other period in history has considered reasonable . . . And it is this waiting for things - for the real life to come - which creates a climate in which a sizable segment of students can, at least temporarily, be seduced into following the lead of the small group of militants."[3]

Thus the adolescents develop their own culture, not with the goals of socializing people into the larger society as is the case of initiation rites, but as a means to form their own identities without knowing ultimate adult roles or caring about those that they might fill.

II. Confusion on the Role of the University in a Changing Society

An important ingredient in the issue of student dissent is the question of the role and nature of the university in the sixties, seventies, and eighties. Nearly everyone seems to have an opinion on this subject. During the past two decades the enrollment of students in higher educatinn has doubled. Nearly half of all high school graduates will attend some type of college this year. Before World War II this percentage was more like one out of ten - the same percentage of high school graduates who presently go to college in most European countries.

During the same two decades while enrollments have doubled, the cost of financing higher education is rising at two or three times the rate of the economy itself. Not only has the disruption of the past several years seriously eroded public confidence in finding more money to support needed programs in higher education, but the lack of consensus as to purpose and function - the place higher education should occupy in serving the needs of this country in the years ahead also is mitigating against further public support.

Although there are wide differences among the educators, public figures, students and administrators as to the essential mission of higher education, for our purposes we can draw the issue clearly between the following two alternatives.

---

2 Mayhew, Lewis B., Contemporary College Students and the Curriculum, SREB Research Monograph No. 14, 1969.

3 Bruno Bettelheim, Statement to the House Special Subcommittee on Education, March 20, 1969.

Should the university continue its traditional function of searching for and transmitting knowledge, or should the university be an instrument of societal change? The first, often called the rationalist philosophy, has the goal of developing the intellect to help students cultivate reason, and solve problems rationally and objectively. The second, often viewed as the instrumentalist approach, emphasizes the full and creative development of the student, not only intellectually but physically, socially, emotionally and culturally. The rationalist argues, as does Professor Bettelheim, that the function of higher education is "preparation for something that you do later." The instrumentalist would argue that one learns now how to solve societal problems while a student by relating what is going on in society directly to his experience in the classroom. Such a person, according to Bettelheim, is "no longer a student at all, because he clearly rejects knowledge as a precondition of any meaningful activity."[4]

Elaborating on the same view is William V. Shannon, one of the senior editors of the New York Times, who wrote recently "The University isn't a forum for political action. It isn't a training ground for revolutionaries. It isn't a residential facility for the psychiatrically maladjusted. It isn't a theater for the acting out of racial fears and phantasies. Other institutions exist in society to meet these human needs, but the University doesn't. . . The University is a quiet place deliberately insulated from the conflicts and pressures of the larger society around it. Reason and stability are essential to its very nature because its aim is truth, not power and because its only resources are ideas, not guns or votes or money."[5]

But alas. Although this beautiful description of the "ivory tower" citadel of learning typifies the nostalgia of alumni who recall their own halcyon days among the halls of ivy, except for those few monastic-like retreats tucked away in the hills, the ivory tower no longer exists in this country. There is no time to "think and reflect" and it is difficult if not impossible to "insulate" the university from society. Students bring the problems of society with them through the gates of the campus into the classroom. So do the faculty. The overwhelming urgency of the urban crisis, poverty, the Viet Nam war, the omnipresent threat of nuclear war, inhumanity, disease, pollution of our streams and the atmosphere and other human-linked problems, the students say, just will not wait four years while we search for the truth and learn how to think!

What Shannon essentially is saying is that we should defend the faith, that the universities are allright as they stand now and anybody who challenges them should be put down. Well the universities are not allright. Certainly there is no consensus in society on this point, although, to be sure there is clear consensus that disruption must be stopped. But here we deal only with symptoms, not the causes of student unrest. Students want to know how they can do their part in solving the human problems of this world. They feel colleges are not providing them with the necessary tools to do so.

There is mounting evidence that society agrees with the students on this score. In a recent study of parent attitudes, for example, more parents ranked the instrumentalist philosophy which emphasizes the total development of the student, than ranked

4 Bettelheim, op cit.

5 William V. Shannon in the Denver Post, May 4, 1969.

the rationalist approach to higher education.[6] But there is great dissension within higher education on this question. Professor J. S. Tonsor of the University of Michigan recently asserted that it's up to the student and his parents to find the kind of school that will meet the needs of the student. Hence they would have to shop around and try to find an institution that would cater to whatever interests the student might have.[7] The unreality of that view is obvious when one considers over half of the students who come to college have no idea why they are there, except that it is the thing to do. Tonsor's position also suggests that parents have the financial means to send their son or daughter anywhere they wish. This is just not so. It is increasingly clear the urban university is going to carry the enrollment load simply because students cannot afford to live away from home. Therefore, if the local institution does not meet the student's needs he has no choice but to go elsewhere.

The evidence on the side of academic inadequacy is most persuasive. To the charges of poor teaching methods, irrelevance of the curriculum, inadaptability to the changes wrought by science and technology there is no doubt higher education must plead guilty. Professors persist in utilizing pedantic teaching methods that have changed little over the past 300 years despite many innovations, including the ready availability of very creative means of utilizing electronic inventions to greatly enhance and facilitate the teaching and learning process. Ironically the very professors who teach business industry, and government how to improve their organizational effectiveness, efficiency and output, seem incapable of applying their know-how toward improving the University! There can be little doubt that the function and structure of higher education must be overhauled very drastically in the next decade to meet societal and student demands. The public cannot and will not continue to foot the bill to do "more of the same" when there is some real doubt that the "same" is appropriate. All this is aside from the enormous problem of restoring public confidence in higher education's ability to deal with disorder.

III. Inability to Change Systematically and Rapidly

Some of the same problems that plague the college in its inability to gain consensus on its role in a period of rapid change also operate to inhibit it from changing itself systematically and rapidly as an institution.

The lack of authority of liberal college administrations to bring about rapid change is due in part to the balance of power. The faculty controls the curriculum, admissions requirements, graduation and degree requirements and other crucial functions. The faculty finds changing its own structures and requirements most difficult and most time consuming. And there seems to be little motivation to modernize procedures.

Colleges and universities are so organized that the only way they can take on new interests is by accretion. Everything is an add on. For every course dropped, for instance, it seems half dozen new ones are added - one of the reasons why the costs of higher education are rising at two or three times the rate of the economy itself.

---

6 Burns B. Crookston. A Study of Attitudes Concerning University Relationships with Students. NASPA Journal 5:2, October, 1967, pp. 134-139.

7 J. S. Tonsor. Address before National Association of Manufacturers, April 1, 1969.

Avenues toward eliminating less relevant commitments in order to meet new challenges are few in number. The problem of establishing new priorities, is, of course, inevitably linked to eliminating some of the old functions and old priorities. This the academic man finds difficult to do.

In order to increase the effectiveness of college teaching the whole Ph.D. system would have to be drastically modified or a new teaching degree developed to give dignity and emphasis to the art of teaching. The Ph.D. is a research degree. Those who can achieve it are supposed to know their subject and therefore know how to teach it, an assumption that unfortunately does not hold in many, many cases.

Just as the colleges have been imposing higher and higher course requirement standards on high schools as prerequisites for college, so the graduate schools are imposing more and more requirements on undergraduate colleges to qualify students for admission to graduate school. Furthermore the whole system of accreditation, despite its original laudable purpose of setting and raising standards, has created a stranglehold on the ability of a given college department to venture into innovative programs lest they lose their accreditation. A major university is accredited by literally dozens if not hundreds of agencies. The result of all of this accreditation is to impose uniformity on the American system of higher education - a straitjacket that is extremely difficult to get out of when one thinks of innovation and rapid change in college course offerings and teaching methodology.

President Howard R. Bowen of the University of Iowa said, "We have employed thousands of faculty, raised salaries and fringe benefits, built buildings, purchased books and equipment, entered new academic fields and organized new institutions but we have not devised a form of liberal education that fits the late Twentieth Century."[8]

IV. Lack of Preventive and Student Development Programs

Although Societal changes and the general student revolt of the sixties have been primarily responsible for the demise of the in loco parentis function of the college in regulating the lives of the students outside the classroom, the colleges have been unable to adjust and modify staff approaches with students in ways that more effectively respond to the resultant new student responsibilities.

In general, until recent years the educational approach of student personnel deans and staff has been based on control of students and remediation. Historically the university has played a very passive role in relating to students outside the classroom. The deans of students tried to be the friendly helper and counselor, but essentially they waited around for something to happen and then reacted. If the student fell apart emotionally or physically they helped put him together through counseling and health programs. If he got in behavioral trouble the deans punished and rehabilitated. As counselors student personnel staff were not expected to take positions on any real issue. And because they have been linked with the administration there have been implicit or explicit expectations that they not speak out.

This reactive, remediational style of student personnel and faculty func-

8 Howard R. Bowen. University of Iowa, Speculator, April, 1969.

tioning does not work with the current generation of college students. Colleges that have not recognized this fact are among those experiencing the most serious student revolts. The new style of dealing with students outside the classroom must emphasize prevention and student development. Staff can no longer play the passive, waiting game. They must get out on the campus and attempt to influence the students "where its at." Such interventions include getting students to look at their contemplated action. Hopefully students are made aware that when they do something destructive, when they do something to injure others, they are essentially making a statement on how they choose to live their lives. If students are worked with in this way, the chances are improved they will modify any decision to act in ways that may be harmful to others.

The point is those who are most effective with students of the seventies are no longer either the guidance counselor, or reactive, tough disciplinarians. Neither is likely to survive in this volatile student area. The student development faculty member of the seventies must be a specially trained applied behavioral scientist - a combination teacher, trainer, researcher and counselor - functioning essentially as a teacher outside the classroom. He is a key factor in the development of the student as a significant individual and effective citizen.[9]

V. Inability of the University to Act Decisively and Effectively

Why have the disruptors been permitted to persist on college campuses? Why haven't presidents and deans been able to handle the situation promptly and forthrightly? Is it a question of being gutless or spineless as is often charged? In responding to these questions let us consider the following factors:

A. The tactics of confrontation are not understood. It appears that relatively few university administrators understand the tactics of confrontation. If one is to review carefully student revolutionary literature as well as the disruptive tactics being utilized in colleges and universities a rather clear and predictable pattern emerges that is strikingly parallel to the revolutionary tactics utilized by the labor movement during the early decades of this century. Ten strategies can be readily identified:

First, get an issue. In the early 1900s it was easy for labor to identify a number of issues resulting from low pay, poor working conditions, lack of fringe benefits, etc. It is also easy for college activists to identify a number of issues such as irrelevance of curricula, poor teaching, lack of interest in students by professors, the war in Viet Nam, or the failure of society to solve its problems.

It is important that the issue be one with which the masses can readily identify. Appeal to them at the "gut level" - an issue about which they have very strong feelings. In colleges this often means exploiting what on the surface appears to be relatively insignificant issues. At a western state university for example, student activists began their climb to power by enlisting strong support for a campaign to eliminate women's housing regulations. This issue gave the activists enough voting support to sweep them into power in student government. While their real goal was, and still is education reform, they could not get an apathetic student body to rally behind so comprehensive an issue, so they continued to

9 Weston Morrill, Allen E. Ivey and E. R. Oetting. The College Counseling Center - A Center for Student Development. In Heston and Frick, Counseling for the Liberal Arts College. Antioch Press, 1968, pp. 141-157.

work on those issues where they could get support. Next on the list was to gain "student control" of the Student Center. While in actual fact students have had policy control for years, but failed to effectively exercise it, the general student body being unaware of this, the student leaders could make a great issue of it and then claim "victory" when the University "capitulated" to their demands. Coupled with the issue of control of the Student Center was the demand that 3.2 beer be served there. In a State where 3.2. beer is legal for 18 year-olds this was a sure-fire issue to gain great support. It did. The idea was then to shift this gained support into some other more pressing and critical issues in the general area of educational reform.

Second, identify a common enemy. In the case of labor, the enemy was, of course, management. To the college students the target is easily identified as the "administration". Identifying a common enemy is nothing more than the old business of finding a scapegoat everyone can hate. It seems to build solidarity in a group when there is a person or group who can be identified as being responsible for all their miseries. Hitler did this by blaming Germany's troubles on Jews. In our own national history we have at various times blamed our problems on Catholics, Jews, Blacks, Indians and others.

Third, make a list of demands. It is important that this list contain a few reasonable demands, but the great majority should be unrealistic and unreasonable - - demands that the enemy (management or the university administration) cannot possibly accede to. The rhetoric of these "demands" should be replete with epithets and emotionally charged language designed to further convince the group that the "enemy" is really the enemy, while at the same time calculated to get the management "up tight" - to behave angrily, defensively and, consequently, repressively. If the establishment does so react it is used as justification for the use of force or violence. Obviously, the revolutionary leader will say, the enemy can be dealt with in no other way.

Fourth, threaten violence. Having convinced the revolting group that violence may be not only necessary, but legitimate, it is important to mobilize the group in such a way as to make violence appear very probable, even "necessary" to attain the desired outcome. This is a dramatic change in tactics from the pattern of non-violence typified by the lunch counter sit-ins during the Civil Rights movement of the early sixties. Here it must be stressed that, except for the very few revolutionaries and anarchists, the vast majority of student movements still are non-violent. Nonetheless there have been instances this past year when violence was not only threatened, but actually carried out.

Fifth, be willing to negotiate. Underneath the epithets, strong language and confronting and intimidating behavior there must be a willingness to negotiate with the establishment. Naturally it is highly desirable that such negotiations take place in a setting most favorable to the revolutionary. In colleges this is often a mass meeting at which the "negotiations" are supposed to be conducted. You can imagine how such an atmosphere would be toward any constructive discussion of issues.

Sixth, keep the pressure during the negotiations. Assuming the establishment does not fall into the trap of negotiation in an atmosphere of threat and intimidation, but rather insists such a meeting take place around a table outside sight and sound of the masses, it is still important to keep up the pressure by main-

taining the strike, sit-in, or occupation of a building.

Seventh, maintain throughout the negotiation the legitimacy of all demands. It is important to maintaining the solidarity of the group not to "give-in" on any demands. The "non-negotiability" of certain demands is therefore emphasized. This and the other rhetoric used in the demands is often directed more toward holding the group than impressing the establishment.

Eighth, finally agree to some concessions and make a "temporary" settlement. Agree to those demands that are realistic and reasonable (and in the case of the college student it is very easy to agree that a number of the grievances expressed by students are legitimate). But it is important to end the negotiations on the note that students are unhappy with the settlement and will therefore be back to deal with the establishment later. Thus the pressure is continued on the establishment.

Ninth, tell the group we won and we lost. Announce success on those issues where the establishment "capitulated." But stress the long list of demands where the establishment failed to yield. This has the effect of maintaining the group and keeping the movement going to work on the unfinished business.

Tenth, repeat the process on a modified list of demands. Those demands that no longer have currency in maintaining group support are quietly abandoned. New, more viable demands designed to attract new followers while maintaining the solidarity of the existing group are added to the list. Armed with an old and new set of demands the revolution begins anew with fresh troops and an even more dedicated group of followers.

It should be emphasized an important distinction exists between revolutionary strategies in this country and those that have taken place in the Communist and Facist countries in other parts of the world. With the exception of the very small band of anarchists, nilhilists and radical revolutionaries who are bent upon destroying the system of education in this country, both the early labor tactics as well as the more recent revolutionary tactics in higher education have been characterized by no intention of taking over. In marked contrast are the revolutionary tactics of the Communist and Facist movements elsewhere where there has been every intention of taking over. Our college students generally have no interest in running the university or managing it. They do very much want to change it and they very much want to be a part of the change and have an opportunity to influence decisions, but they are not so naive as to believe that the colleges would be better run by eighteen to twenty year olds than they are learned faculty and trained professionals.

This systematic pattern of revolutionary tactics has become relatively widespread in this country during the past three or four years at colleges and universities across the country. Only where there is violence do we hear about it through the news media. The great bulk of peaceful confrontations quietly go on; the University responds in constructive ways; the students in turn respond constructively and progress is made toward needed change in higher education.

B. College administrators were not hired to be field commanders. The style of student revolt and disruption calls for advance planning and preparation, quick thinking, quick reacting, and precision in execution of decisions. It also

calls for the ability to, when needed, carry out decisions with a proper and sufficient number of law enforcement officers from campus, as well as off campus.

By and large, college administrators are drawn from the ranks of the faculty. Most are professors. Professors are a breed unto themselves. They believe in thinking, reflecting, researching, debating, but they do not often have to decide. Decisions they do make as administrators are largely not of this urgent, confronting nature, but can be thoughtthrough after considerable consultation with others prior to arriving at a decision. Most college administrators are not trained or prepared to make command decisions in emergencies.

It amazes, if not amuses executives from business and industrial organizations that there is no career line to the top in higher education. The plain fact of the matter is that more often than not the problems of management and administration in higher education are in the hands of amateurs. It is not at all surprising to see a description such as the following as a guideline for a search committee to screen candidates for the administrative post of dean as follows:

> "A reputable teacher-scholar who never thought of becoming an administrator before."

This reflects the arrogant, often elitist attitude toward management and administration held by many faculty. It is a common practice, for instance, to pass around the chairmanship of an academic department on some rotation basis. Professors don't like to deal with the unpleasantness associated with administration particularly in making decisions. They don't want to be bothered with such mundane matters.

C. College administrators lack authority and power. The third obstacle in the way of acting effectively and decisively in time of crisis is that college administrators have less authority and power than is supposed. During the past two or three decades faculties have increasingly become much more interested in policy making and have asserted their power and influence within the univeristy. As a consequence administrative officers often find themselves without the necessary power and authority to make the critical decisions necessary in the type of crises we are confronted with today. The "forgotten men and women" Logan Wilson said, "have been the administrators. Their responsibility has been enlarged and at the same time their authority to discharge it has been undermined."[10]

A properly organized faculty or student government can legislate but neither can play an administrative role. On many campuses both student and faculty governments have demonstrated their impotence in the face of disruption. Once the trouble starts about all they do is pass resolutions which the radicals can gleefully ignore. If the administration is denied the power to act no one acts and the situation rapidly deteriorates into anarchy.

"To put the matter as bluntly as possible," Roger Heyns, Chancellor of the Berkeley campus of the University of California recently said, "I feel that is is necessary to give more power and effective responsibility to college and

---

10 Logan Wilson, "A Few Kind Words for Academic Administrators," Educational Record, Winter, 1969.

university administrators at all levels. I emphasize at all levels, lest anyone think I might mean centralization of power in a top executive."[11]

D. Faculty indecision. The fourth factor has been the inability of many faculties to make up their mind on setting policies and delegating authority to administrators. There exists a wide schism among faculties on how the administration should handle disruption. The increased size of institutions has made faculty government processes cumbersome. Change comes at an incredibly glacial rate. For instance on one campus it took three and one half years of study, debate and persuasion before the faculty agreed to allow students to sit on the Committee on Student Life.

As a result of these difficulties the country is full of wounded college presidents and deans who would love to beat a hasty, if not graceful exit. No wonder there are more than 300 colleges and universities seeking a president and almost that many looking for a dean of students!

In 1960 the American Council on Education reported the average number of years for a college president to serve as between ten and eleven. In 1968 the median tenure was just under six years. Wilson concludes, "only the Holy Trinity could match the qualifications set forth by most institutions in their searches for academic presidents. Once on the job there simply is not enough hours in the day for administrators to do all the things their varied constituents expect of them ."[12]

VI. Inability of the University to Discipline Promptly and Effectively

Why have the colleges in recent years been seemingly so ineffective in dealing with the discipline of student disruptors? They have been accused of becoming bogged down in procedures, interminable delays and watered down decisions - all of which seem to make no sense whatever to a public who want stern and prompt action. College alumni, who recall the efficient and simplistic manner in which deans of men of a decade or two ago could summarily suspend or dismiss students from the college, are appalled at what they consider the inability of college discipline committees to make prompt decisions.

What has happened? The answer is not only have students, often with the support of faculty, brought increasing pressure on the university to have student-faculty discipline bodies determine serious cases of student discipline, the courts themselves have handed down a number of important decisisons in the past decade that make it clear higher education must observe certain minimum amenities of procedural due process. The courts are saying that the right to make a living is now linked with a college education; therefore, a college education must be viewed very much like a property right the deprivation of which cannot be ordered without due process. Hence, in any serious case of student discipline that might lead to separating the student from the university the institution is obliged to fulfill certain requirements of due process that must include at least the following:

---

11 Roger Heyns in Stress and Campus Response, G. K. Smith (ed), Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, 1969.

12 Wilson, loc. cit.

1. The student should be given adequate notice in writing of the specific ground or grounds and the nature of the evidence on which the disciplinary proceedings are based.

2. The student should be given an opportunity for a hearing in which the disciplinary authority provides a fair opportunity for hearing the student's position, explanations and evidence.

3. No disciplinary action should be taken on grounds which are not supported by any substantial evidence.[13]

These court actions have all but stopped colleges from invoking summary suspension or dismissals, although a temporary suspension for just cause is still permitted. Accordingly colleges are revising their disciplinary procedures and have been experiencing considerable difficulty in being able to make these work properly. Lawyers, intervening on behalf of students, have complicated attempts to conduct some kind of reasonable proceeding that is within the bounds of fair play and at the same time does not permit it to take on the features of a court. Colleges, even those with law schools, just are not equipped to function as courts.

In sum, colleges are experiencing considerable difficulty in being able to properly adapt from the traditional in loco parentis (in the place of the parent) discipline to the much more legalistic and formalistic procedures now required.

WHAT CAN BE DONE?

I. A Preventive Program of Crisis Intervention and Conflict Management Must be Developed

Teams of faculty and student development staff should be available and knowledgeable when called upon to work directly with those planning the demonstration or disruption, attempting to influence the outcome in such a way as to be most productive while avoiding any violence or disruptive tactics. Effective staff and faculty intervention and influence has stemmed many potentially dangerous situations and channeled them into peaceful, constructive demonstrations or activities.

Crisis intervention and conflict management teams need special training and special advance preparation. Here it must be emphasized that the intent of a preventive program is not to "put down" rebellions; we are educational institutions not police forces. Rather the intent is to exert legitimate influence on those who plan demonstrations. Most movements and demonstrations are usually not intended just for the hell of it, but have a serious purpose in mind and a point ot be made. In those instances when the point is legitimate the efforts of the crisis intervention teams is not just to stop the group from disrupting - although this is certainly important - but to assist the group in making their protest effective within the ground rules set by the university for peaceful expression and assembly. The influence of crisis intervention teams has often resulted in more moderate, yet more effective tactics used by student activists in order to

13 United States District Court for the Western District of Missouri, en banc. Memorandum of Opinion on Student Learning, 1963.

achieve certain types of educational reform within a university.

II. Deal Decisively with Disruption

Before anything can be done toward overcoming the difficulties discussed above it is essential to establish orderly processes in the academy. As Sidney Hook observed, "order is possible without justice, but justice is impossible without order."[14]

The first step is to establish and widely disseminate policies on student freedom of expression and peaceful assembly. Such policies must make clear the college position on these vital issues, including what constitutes a violation of the policies and the punishment that may be assessed against violators. Second, explicit administrative plans and procedures must be developed for coping with small and large demonstrations in order to maintain the policies, as well as to deal with violations. The failure of many institutions to deal effectively with student disruption has been around maintaining the naive hope that "that sort of thing won't happen here" or not taking these plans seriously enough to work them out in sufficient detail to anticipate the various reactions that might be expected from disruptors. The larger the group the more elaborate the plan must be. Close liaison must be established with law enforcement agencies for assistance when and where needed. Decisions must be made about who is in charge under what conditions when outside law enforcement agencies are utilized.

III. When Action is Necessary, Act Quickly and Decisively

One cannot merely threaten to suspend students or threaten arrest. When the decision is made to act the action must be decisive. Across the country radicals have been betting (and winning) the administration would be confused and unable to act when confronted with demonstrations or disruptions. The longer radicals can disrupt, hold a building, the greater the likelihood of their success. As Professor Hook observed, "both at Berkeley and Columbia failure to act decisively at the first disruption of university functions undoubtedly contributed to the student's expectations that they could escalate the lawlessness with impunity."[15] At Columbia students held a building for several days, each day increasing their numbers and support of students and some faculty for the issue they were using as an excuse to occupy the building.

In contrast, at Colorado State University, students occupied a classroom building one morning in November, 1968, sometime before four a.m. By six a.m. the building was surrounded by University police, preventing any additional persons from gaining access. By seven a.m. all had been given notice of suspension. By 8:40 a.m. all were arrested and in jail. Since the building was to have been opened for business and classes at 7:45 a.m., the disruption essentially lasted less than one hour.

Naturally, this ability to respond so quickly and decisively was no accident. The administration had begun developing plans for handling disruption shortly after the 1964 occupation of Sproul Hall at Berkeley. These plans have been reviewed and modified at regular intervals.

---

14 Hook, loc. cit.

15 Hook, loc. cit.

Whenever a demonstration is imminent a planning session is held to review plans and procedures on how the univ ersity will respond, including the crisis intervention and preventive effort. Because it is important for the planners to advertise in order to enlist numerical support, with rare exceptions there is advance knowledge of demonstrations.

Having tested the ability of the university to respond to a major disruption, the same radical group attempted to test the University response to a modified tactic. Four days after the abortive building occupation students sat-in the Administration Building but were careful to observe the univeristy peaceful assembly policies by not occupying private offices or otherwise interferring with business in the building. The test of the limits came when they refused to end their peaceful sit-in at the time the building was to be closed. "After all," they argued, "We are here to demonstrate against the war. We are peaceful. We are not bothering anyone. What is wrong with our staying in the building after it is closed. This is only a minor univeristy rule that is being violated and, the cause we advocate makes this unimportant."

The University did not yield to this tactic. Demonstrators were given notice to leave or face suspension and arrest. Most left, but eleven stayed to be suspended and arrested, booked and released from the premises. The following day a similar sit-in took place. When given notice to leave at the closing hour or be suspended and arrested, all left. The same exercise was repeated the following day with the same result. The point had been made: the predictability of the univeristy to act had been established. Later during the Spring of 1969 there took place a series of confrontations and sit-ins by minority students who were making demands for increasing the numbers of Black and Mexican-American students in the university and developing some special programs for minority students. Thanks partly to effective staff and faculty crisis intervention that led to a series of effective negotiations the confrontations were peaceful and most of the demands were met. There was no violence although there were some very tense moments.

IV. Develop Orderly Disciplinary Procedures and Processes

Documents prepared by a number of national associations in consultation with the legal fraternity and the American Civil Liberties Union are available to assist any college in developing a system of orderly due process. It is not necessary that courtroom procedures be adopted, nor is it appropriate. The function of the university is to teach. Student discipline is a vital function of the teaching process. It is not the function of the university to assume the responsibility of the court.

It is important that the student-faculty hearing committee system be set up in a way to permit alternate hearing bodies to function in the event there is a need to discipline a substantially large group of students. Experience at Colorado State University during the Fall of 1968 in disciplining 164 students made urgent the need to develop such flexibility. The result was to establish a student-faculty discipline panel of 23 members from which it is possible to draw as many as three hearing committees that can meet concurrently to handle large numbers if necessary.

A DECADE OF DRAMATIC CHANGE

Once having dealt with the question of who is in charge and maintaining order on the campus, the university can and must turn without delay to the question of educational reform. For surely we have entered into a period of the most dramatic, agonizing and rapid change in the history of higher education.

Dealing with disruption is only dealing with the symptom. Student unrest is not only not going away, it is increasing. The unrest in the junior and senior high schools is adequate testimony to this fact. "One of the ironies of higher education," President Bowen remarked, "is that we have been through our greatest era of growth and development, but have not captured the enthusiasm of our undergraduates."[16] The enthusiasm and drive of students for needed change in higher education need to be converted into productive and creative forces for change. The recent Xerox survey indicated that about 38% of our college students are classified as moderate reformers. Those who recognize the need for change in higher education must become activists in eliciting a commitment from this moderate reform group to get actively involved, not only in the processes of student government but in educational reform itself. The best way to deal with irresponsibility is to confront the irresponsible with the necessity to be responsible. Students have not failed to heed the call in the past. There is every reason to believe they will rally to such a call in the future.

Finally there is the long range problem of what to do about the huge number of students who come to college with no real understanding of the purposes for which they are there. A way must be found to make college more purposeful for most if not all students who enter. It is this purposelessness that has added fuel to the student unrest of this decade.

As a partial answer to this problem the idea of a universal service draft for all men and women who reach their eighteenth birthday or graduate from high school has much merit. Such a system could provide a variety of options ranging from military service to work in hospitals, social agencies, in the ghettos, in the country, in the forests, in foreign countries, in Peace Corps and VISTA type activities, in government agencies even in public school systems. These experiences would help our youth develop an understanding of, and a commitment to their nation and to the society of which they are a part - a commitment they can rarely get from studying about social problems while in college. A year or so in one of these areas of service will also put the student into a situation where he must take on an increasingly adult role and adult responsibilities. Consequently, a decision is more likely to be made by those serving about whether they should or should not go to college. If the decision is yes the students are apt to be much more clear on why and where he is going. Such a system would make colleges a much more adult-oriented type of institution where students would be - and properly so - treated as adults, not merely as over-grown children.

The challenge of change cannot and must not be avoided by higher education. We have the means. We have the desire. We have the know how. We have not turned enough attention to our own processes of being effective institutions functionally, managerially, administratively and creatively in and outside the classroom. We must get on with the task.

---

16 Bowen, loc. cit.